

On the first point, I don't think we should delete the fact that the two chairmen to whom I am supposed to have made that statement agree with me that this incident never happened. If you are going to cite what your supporting information is, then I believe you are obligated to include my assertion that it never happened and the comments from the persons to whom it is said to have been addressed.

The first sentence on page 3 needs to have inserted after the word "that" the following:

...that, in not establishing a blind trust...

In the absence of this insertion, the reader would not know what paragraph number we are talking about.

Also, I don't recall saying "that's fair enough." It is not fair enough to insert a violation of spirit without reflecting the legal requirements of the Watergate reforms.

The report on Mexico reflects not one dissenter but four or five. It is wrong to refer to "Casey's forced conclusion." The reality is that the estimate itself is the judgment of the Director. It is my responsibility to express my conclusion which is what I did. The fact that it was drafted nine times does not indicate that it was forced, merely that the subject was contentious. There were many people involved in the drafting, redrafting, editing and commenting. It is not at all unusual for a long document on a complicated subject to be passed back and forth many times, and the way it was put creates a false impression.

I enclose my letter of 13 January to the WASHINGTON POST which brings out that deletions in the original draft were made by the analyst who complained about the estimate being restored. Also attached is a copy of the House Committee's report on this subject.